

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION

GLORIA S. JACKSON,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 10-2856
)	
CITY OF MEMPHIS,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER

Before the Court are the April 26, 2013 Motion for Summary Judgment by Defendant City of Memphis (the "City") and the Magistrate Judge's July 1, 2013 Report and Recommendation (the "Report"). (Motion, ECF No. 32); (Report, ECF No. 33.) Plaintiff Gloria S. Jackson ("Jackson") has not objected to the Magistrate Judge's Report and the time for doing so has passed. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) ("Within fourteen days after being served with a copy [of the Magistrate Judge's Report], any party may serve and file written objections to such proposed findings and recommendations as provided by rules of court."). The Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court grant the City's Motion for Summary Judgment and that Jackson's complaint be dismissed in its entirety. For the following reasons, the Court

ADOPTS the Report of the Magistrate Judge. The City's Motion for Summary Judgment is GRANTED.

Congress intended 28 U.S.C. § 636 to relieve the burden on the federal judiciary by permitting the assignment of district court duties to magistrate judges. See United States v. Curtis, 237 F.3d 598, 602 (6th Cir. 2001) (citing Gomez v. United States, 490 U.S. 858, 869-70 (1989)); see also Baker v. Peterson, 67 F. App'x 308, 310 (6th Cir. 2003). "A district judge must determine de novo any part of a magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). "'Only those specific objections to the magistrate's report . . . will be preserved for [] review.'" Carson v. Hudson, 421 F. App'x 560, 563 (6th Cir. 2011) (quoting Souter v. Jones, 395 F.3d 577, 585 (6th Cir. 2005)); see also Smith v. Detroit Fed'n of Teachers, Local 231, 829 F.2d 1370, 1373 (6th Cir. 1987).

After reviewing the evidence, the court is free to accept, reject, or modify the proposed findings or recommendations of the magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). The district court is not required to review—under a de novo or any other standard—those aspects of the report and recommendation to which no objection is made. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). The district court should adopt the findings and rulings of the

magistrate judge to which no specific objection is filed. Id.
at 151.

Jackson has not objected to the Magistrate Judge's Report. The deadline for objecting, which was explicitly referenced in the Report, has passed. Because Jackson has failed to object, Arn counsels the Court to adopt the Report in its entirety. Id. Adopting the Report is consistent with the policies underlying § 636, specifically judicial economy and protecting against the "functions of the district court [being] effectively duplicated as both the magistrate and the district court perform identical tasks." Howard v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs., 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991).

The Magistrate Judge's Report is ADOPTED. The City's Motion for Summary Judgment is GRANTED. Jackson's complaint is DISMISSED.

So ordered this 6th day of August, 2013.

s/ Samuel H. Mays, Jr._____
SAMUEL H. MAYS, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE